



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,431	03/16/2004	David Alan Johnson	5	3091

7590 04/05/2005

David A. Johnson
7945 Ruststone Ct.
Colorado Springs, CO 80919

EXAMINER

FENTY, JESSE A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2815

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

BN

16/80/431

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

033105

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Enclosed is a corrected copy of the PTO-892 mailed with the Non-Final Office Action on 03/22/05 and an Interview Summary of a telephonic interview with inventor on 03/31/05.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Pro se inventor Johnson called Examiner on the morning of 03/31/05 to clarify prosecution procedure and to discuss the differences between the prior art and the instant application. Inventor orally explained why the prior art of Deshpande does not anticipate the instant claims. Examiner informed inventor that a response to the non-final office action mailed 03/22/05 must be in writing. Examiner explained the nature of a broad reading of the claims. That is, even if a prior art reference is not the exact same invention, or is used for a different purrrpose than the pending claims, the prior art reference still may contain all the claimed elements and be cited as valid prior art. The applicant's task is to clearly distinguish the claims of the proposed invention from the disclosure of the prior art.

In the afternoon, Examiner called pro se inventor Johnson to cite various sections that will be helpful in replying to the Non-Final Office Action, such as 37 CFR 1.2, 1.121 and 1.126; MPEP Sections 710, 714, 714.02 and 713.04.